

Application Serial No.: 09/973,730
Reply to Office Action dated March 4, 2005

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 and 10-15 are presently active in this case, Claim 15 having been amended by way of the present Amendment.

In the outstanding Official Action, the drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The Applicants respectfully submit that the Figures 1-4 clearly depict three sets of threadings, as recited in the claims. For example, the figures depict a calibration threading 17, which is part of the calibration mechanism, a first threading 5, which is part of the first retainer mechanism, and a second threading 13, which is part of the second retainer mechanism. The Applicants note that the second threading in the embodiment depicted in Figure 2, for example, is a groove 13 that is described as having a fairly low-gradient pitch on page 5, lines 19-20, of the specification. The pitch of the groove 13 provides for the fine adjustment of the pipette. The groove 13 is a thread in the broad sense of the word. The specification has been amended to clarify which features of the disclosed, non-limiting embodiment correspond to the features recited in the claims. Care has been taken such that no new matter has been entered. Accordingly, the Applicants request the withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

The specification was objected to for failing to provide antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. As discussed above, the specification discloses in the drawings and

Application Serial No.: 09/973,730
Reply to Office Action dated March 4, 2005

written description a calibration threading 17, which is part of the calibration mechanism, a first threading 5, which is part of the first retainer mechanism, and a second threading 13, which is part of the second retainer mechanism. The specification has been amended to clarify which features of the disclosed, non-limiting embodiment correspond to the features recited in the claims, thereby providing clear antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, the Applicants request the withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. As discussed above, the specification discloses in the drawings and written description a calibration threading 17, which is part of the calibration mechanism, a first threading 5, which is part of the first retainer mechanism, and a second threading 13, which is part of the second retainer mechanism. The specification has been amended to clarify which features of the disclosed, non-limiting embodiment correspond to the features recited in the claims. Accordingly, the Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 15 has been amended to correct the antecedent basis problem. Accordingly, the Applicants request the withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection.

Application Serial No.: 09/973,730
Reply to Office Action dated March 4, 2005

Consequently, in view of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Attorney of Record

Christopher D. Ward
Registration No. 41,367

Customer Number

22850

Tel. (703) 413-3000
Fax. (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 10/01)

GJM:CDW:brf
I:\atty\cdw\21xxxx\214910US6\am1.doc